

fancy, and was followed by others of generally increasing size until, in 1855, was held the first Paris Universal Exposition, which inspired the emulation of other nations. An idea of the growth of the Parisian world's fairs from that date may be derived from the following figures: The exposition of 1855 had a motive force for its machinery of 350 horsepower, and it attracted 23,954 exhibitors and over 5,000,000 visitors. The fair of 1867 had 626 horsepower, and 52,000 exhibitors. That of 1878 had 2500 horsepower, 52,838 exhibitors, 1,600,000 visitors. In 1889 there were over 5000 horsepower, of which but half was actually used, 55,486 exhibitors and 32,500,000 visitors. Next year will see a prodigious leap in the motive power, for it is estimated that 45,000 horsepower may be needed, although half that amount will quite possibly suffice. Some 20,000 horsepower will be installed for electric lighting alone. It is noteworthy that the distribution of power throughout the exposition will be by electricity. The exhibitors from the United States alone will number over 2000. The number of visitors expected is 60,000,000, equal to three-fourths of the population of the United States.

A fair such as that of 1900, or of 1889, is an event of tremendous importance to a nation from purely financial considerations. To the last one is attributed an increase in French railroad receipts alone of over \$15,000,000, and exports for the year increased \$90,000,000. Next year foreign visitors are expected to leave \$250,000,000 behind them. A single restaurant out of the eighty-six cafes and bars at the exposition of 1889, cleared over \$300,000, while the profits of five others averaged \$40,000. Cafe concessions for 1900 are now ruling at \$10,000 in price. More than 20,000 workmen are employed on the grounds making ready for the coming exposition, and a much larger number are benefited through the outside industrial activity caused by the preparations. The number thus kept busy is estimated at 150,000.

A feature of the exposition of 1900, which is rather a departure from that of previous fairs, will be the selective character of the exhibits. All public fairs are necessarily big advertising schemes, but the authorities are determined that in this case the commodities advertised shall be worth advertising. Doubtless many visitors to Chicago in 1893, while profoundly impressed with the conception of the show as a whole, and with the buildings, were disappointed with much that was inside of them, and saw much that suggested the annual fair in some rural county of boyhood memories. The Paris show does not have a whole prairie to spread over, and its managers perforce must discriminate in what and how much they admit. The principle of selection governs the American Commission, which has been in desperate straits to ward off the attacks of would-be exhibitors who demand any number of times over the space that Commissioner Peck's efforts have finally wrung from parsimonious French authorities. The American machine tool builders have decided to erect at their own expense, a building at the Vincennes annex, seven miles from the main grounds.

A commendable policy which is now being pursued in Paris and which unfortunately we did not follow at Chicago, is the embellishment of the fair grounds with substantial and permanent works of architecture. Such will be the Alexander III

bridge across the Seine, the triumphal arch at the entrance to the grounds, which will cost about \$300,000, and the two fine art palaces which, together, will reach \$4,500,000. The monumental gateway will not only be a masterpiece of decorative architecture, but of inventive genius as well, for the ticket office will be arranged to admit 60,000,000 persons an hour. — *Current Literature.*

General Otis is an ardent Catholic, as the Spanish priests in Manila soon found out. It is reported that he has succumbed entirely to their influence. Whether this be true or not we cannot say: but his reference, in his interview, to the complications of church and state would indicate the trend of his mind, and is very Catholic and un-American. He says:

After all, the military question is, perhaps, not the most important. The question of establishing civil government is far more complex, and requires the most careful action in order to avoid mistakes. The relations of the church and state afford all manner of pitfalls, and bring out many points that require most careful work and profound study.

How can the relations of church and state afford pitfalls? Under American institutions there is no such thing as relations between church and state, and General Otis is old enough to know it. As the Czar of the Philippines, of course, he has the power to institute relations between church and state temporarily (he being the state), and take the priests of the Spanish into his innermost counsels. But when he attempts to force the doctrine of church and state upon the United States he finds some difficulty. This has been tried before by the Catholic Church and utterly failed.

Why should the establishing of civil government be any more complex than it is in any territory within the United States? General Otis and the American people at large have a strange hallucination that American institutions of freedom are complex. The commonest savage will comprehend American principles quicker than we will.

THE WEEKLY is fortunate in being able to give the public, in the issues of last week and this, a series of illustrations of the Maoris of New Zealand, accompanied by very interesting articles dictated by Mr. Rawei. Of all the Polynesian races the Maoris are nearest of kin to the Hawaiian. In fact, the Maoris have a well defined legend tracing their origin directly to the Hawaiian people. The same conditions prevail there as here. In coming in contact with civilization both races are gradually becoming extinct. In his article last week, Mr. Rawei very clearly defined the causes that are working destruction among his people, and one is struck by the strange similarity in the causes that are at work here. It is sad that two so amiable peoples are doomed to become extinct.

Many papers which favor expansion and uphold the general policy of the Administration in the Philippines do not sanction the arrangement made with the Sultan of the Sulu Islands, by which he is given an annuity, and by which polygamy and slavery are permitted in his dominions in return for his

allegiance. According to the dispatches, our treaty with the Sultan provides that any slave in the archipelago may purchase his freedom by paying his owner \$20, and some papers think that in this way slavery will soon come to an end; but the dispatches do not tell us what facilities the Sulu slaves have for obtaining the necessary \$20. Many papers reprint, in connection with the provisions of the treaty, the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

An interesting feature of the situation, in view of the treaty's toleration of slavery, is the praise accorded to it by some of the Republican papers of the North, and the opposition of the Southern Democratic papers. The New York Tribune (Rep.) says, that the news of the treaty "is to be received with sincere satisfaction," and that the agreement "is of the happiest omen for the future government of that important part of the archipelago." The New York Commercial Advertiser (Rep.) calls it "an exceedingly wise and practical arrangement." The New Orleans Picayune (Dem.) denounces it as an "astonishing anomaly," and says that, if actually concluded, the "Constitution of the United States will have to be changed to meet the new conditions." The state of Columbia, S. C. (Dem.) calls it "comic opera."

An editorial which has been widely commented upon appears in the Yale Review (August). President Hadley is one of the editors of the Review, and, though he denies the authorship of the editorial in question, he does not disclaim agreement with the sentiments expressed. The editorial declares that "despite the mists of cant that have been studiously thrown about our position," it is becoming clearer to an increasing number of people that "we have undertaken just what Spain had on her hands in Cuba—the reduction of an unwilling people to subjection;" and that the thing for the United States to do is to "turn back on conquest" and offer the Filipinos "self-government and protection against foreign aggression." It then refers to the inconsistency in recognizing the local autonomy of the Sultan of Sulu, and in refusing to recognize the local autonomy of the Filipinos in the northern islands. — *Literary Digest.*

The H. Hackfeld & Co., Ltd., well known merchants of this city, celebrated the (golden) half-century anniversary of the establishment of the business, by a reception, extended to the friends of the house, at their business quarters, on the 2nd instant, the multitude of guests being entertained sumptuously from 11.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m. The offices were grandly decorated, and the flag of "Faderland" floated proudly from the tall flagstaff at the front of the building. During the reception-hours an excellent musical entertainment was given by the Hawaiian band, under the leadership of Capt. Henri Berger. The guests voiced their appreciation in hearty unison by giving three cheers for the continued prosperity of this progressive and popular house. May the firm live long and prosper.